

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM- FORMING FOAMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL No. 2:18-mn-2873-RMG This Order Relates To <i>City of Camden, et al., v. 3M Company,</i> No. 2:23-cv-03147-RMG <i>City of Camden, et al. v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours, et al.</i> No. 2:23-cv-3230-RMG
---	---

Before the Court is the Town of East Hampton, Town of Harrietstown and Town of Islip (collectively “Towns”)’s November 7, 2023 Motion to Intervene (Dkt. No. 3933). On November 11, 2023, during the pendency of said motion, the Towns filed objections to both settlements. (Dkt. No. 3998 and 3999). Class Counsel filed a response to the Towns’ motion. (Dkt. No. 4022). Therein, Class Counsel notes that “[t]o the extent that the Court deems it necessary to consider and decide the Motion to Intervene, Class Counsel do not object to intervention for the limited purpose of allowing the Court to rule on the Towns’ objections.” (Dkt. No. 4022 at 2) (noting that Class Counsel will “offer any response to the Objection in accordance with the deadlines set forth in the Court’s orders preliminarily approving the 3M water system settlement and the DuPont water system settlement”). As to the *City of Camden, et al. v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours*, the motion to intervene is DENIED. To the extent the Towns are class members, (Dkt. No. 3933 at 13) (“Under the DuPont Proposed Agreement, Towns are ‘Public Water Systems’ as defined under the agreement”), intervention is unnecessary. To the extent the Towns are not members of the settlement reached in *City of Camden, et al. v. 3M Company*, and given Class Counsel does not object thereto, the Court GRANTS the Towns’ motion for the limited purpose of considering said objections under the applicable deadlines.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED

November 20, 2023
Charleston, South Carolina

s/Richard M. Gergel
Richard M. Gergel
United States District Judge